

REMARKS

Claims 10 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Staeb (US 6,019,714). Claims 12 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Staeb in view of Kepert et al. (US 5,520,378).

Claims 10 and 11 have been amended to correct typographic errors and claims 15 to 22 added.

Reconsideration of the application based on the following is respectfully requested

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 10 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Staeb (US 6,019,714).

Staeb discloses a first motor M1, for cutting signatures, which rare then diverted into one of two paths A or B, as shown in Fig. 1. If diverted to path A, the signature goes to cross folding device 26 driven by motor M2, and if to path B to cross-folding device 27 driven by motor M3.

Claim 10 recites a method for cutting and folding printed products comprising the steps of:

driving with a first motor a first loop for cutting a signature and transferring the signature to a first gripper;

driving with a second motor a second loop for tucking the signature into a first jaw and transferring the signature to a second gripper; and

driving with a third motor a third loop for tucking the signature into a second jaw.

Claim 10 thus requires that the same signature tucked into the first jaw is then tucked into the second jaw. The present invention thus for example can provide a double parallel-folded signature (See page 8, lines 11 to 18 for example of the present specification).

Since Staeb splits the product stream into two products, and each signature is only cross-folded once, there is absolutely no teaching or disclosure in Staeb of “driving with a third motor a third loop for tucking the signature into a second jaw” as claimed, as the signature must already have been tucked into a first jaw according to claim 10.

Withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 12 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Staeb in view of Kepert et al. (US 5,520,378).

In view of the above, withdrawal of the rejection to claims 12 and 13 is also respectfully requested.

Withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) thus is respectfully requested.

New Claims

New independent claims 15 and 21 have been added and one example of support is provided in the specification with reference to one embodiment in which: a first motor 170 drives a first loop for cutting a signature and transferring the signature to a first gripper, the first motor 170 driving cutting cylinders 13 and the first gripper 32; a second motor 180 drives a second loop for tucking the signature into a first jaw and transferring the signature to a second gripper; and a third motor 190 drives a third loop for tucking the signature into a second jaw. Cutting cylinder 13 also cut a web into signatures, a first gripper 32 grips signatures and driven by a first motor 170 and a first tucker 37 tucks the signatures and is driven by a second motor. The first gripper 32 and first tucker 37 having a same axis of rotation as shown clearly in Fig 2. Other features in the dependent claims are described in the specification for example at page 8, line 2 to page 10, line 9.

Appl. No. 10/799,245
Amdt. dated December 2, 2004
Reply to Office Action of October 25, 2004

CONCLUSION

The present application is respectfully submitted as being in condition for allowance and applicants respectfully request such action.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC

By: 

William C. Gehris

Reg. No. 38,156

DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC
Patents, Trademarks and Copyrights
485 Seventh Avenue, 14th Floor
New York, New York 10018
(212) 736-1940